

gists concluded there was no use adding to the high hurdles already facing New Frontier legislation in the second session.

With key Senate and House Democrats also turning against the nonappropriated financing, the tide of opinion was enough to halt it. But it remains to be seen whether the trend will continue in the 88th Congress, which starts in January.

The 1961 Invasion Failure in Cuba Perils U.S. Global Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the Washington Evening Star of October 2, 1962:

POINT OF VIEW—1961 INVASION FAILURE IN
CUBA PERILS U.S. GLOBAL POLICIES

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

NEW YORK, October 2.—At his nationally televised September 13 press conference, the President said, "I would like to set (the Cuban situation) in perspective." This is precisely what the President has failed to do.

He has insisted that Castro's Cuba constitutes no political or military threat to the United States or "to any * * * part of this hemisphere," that "Castro is doomed," that "he is no longer feared in Latin America" and that consequently "unilateral intervention on the part of the United States of America cannot currently be either required or justified."

By resting the case against U.S. intervention on a shockingly erroneous estimate of the Cuban situation, the President has evaded a desperately urgent task—to alert the people of this Nation to the grave dangers we face if we go to war against Cuba now, or at any time in the future.

DANGEROUS CONSEQUENCES

Putting the Cuban situation in its true perspective would have required the President to make an excruciatingly painful admission; that the failure to carry through the Cuban invasion in April 1961, has already had dangerous, and perhaps disastrous, consequences for American global policies:

1. This failure has permitted—indeed encouraged—Russia to get a firm military and political foothold in the Western Hemisphere. All Mr. Kennedy's protests to the contrary, this is a growing danger to our security. In the words of Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, addressing the United Nations on September 21, "The threat (to peace) in Cuba arises from the extraordinary and unnecessary flood of Soviet arms and military personnel pouring into Cuba," which "is creating grave concern, not only in this country, but throughout the hemisphere." (This view, if it be the correct one, is at total variance with the view expressed just 1 week earlier by the President.)

2. The unchallenged entrance of Soviet power into the Western Hemisphere has done grave damage to the image of the United States in Latin America, and consequently has accelerated the political slip, drift, and drive to the Communist left in this hemisphere.

USEFULNESS DESTROYED

3. Whatever usefulness or validity the historic Monroe Doctrine may have had before

the invasion, the failure of that invasion and subsequent events have destroyed them.

The Monroe Doctrine, proclaimed by President James Monroe on December 2, 1823, warned the European powers that "we should consider any attempt (on their part) to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." (It is an irony of history that what inspired this doctrine was the attempt of Imperial Russia to penetrate "peacefully" into the American Northwest.)

Mr. Truman, always willing and ready to quarrel over old political bones (especially old Republican bones), recently said, "We're in trouble in Cuba because Ike didn't have the guts to enforce the Monroe Doctrine." Mr. Eisenhower's reasons for not implementing the Monroe Doctrine by use of unilateral force were (A) that the Monroe Doctrine, as updated by the Rio pact, required the United States of America to wait for multilateral or OAS approval of United States action against Cuba, and (B) that Russian military power was not clearly present in Cuba during his administration.

By April 1961, Castro was clearly under the Soviet wing. On the other hand, OAS approval of U.S. support to an invasion had not been secured. Nevertheless Mr. Kennedy gave the invasion the go-light. But when he withdrew U.S. air support at the last moment, one reason apparently was his consideration for the multilateral concept of the Monroe Doctrine.

NEW KENNEDY DOCTRINE

Certainly the President no longer believes either the old unilateral or the new multilateral Monroe Doctrine relevant to the Cuban situation.

Despite frequent lipservice to the Monroe Doctrine, both old and new, the President (currently using the voice of Senator HUMPHREY) now wishes to supplant it with the "Kennedy doctrine."

What, it may be asked here, is the Kennedy doctrine? An analysis of the President's hard-core position on Cuba shows it to be this:

The United States will not initiate any military action against a "peaceful" extension of power in our hemisphere or a "defensive" Soviet military buildup in Cuba, but it will consider an "offensive" buildup to be dangerous to our safety. And, in the event of an armed attack by satellite Cuba against the United States or any of its neighbors, the United States is determined not to wait for other OAS nations to take action—it will unilaterally counterattack the attackers.

THE OLD CONTAINMENT POLICY

Upon even closer examination, this Kennedy doctrine looks quite familiar. And so it is. The Kennedy doctrine proves to be the 15-year-old Truman-Eisenhower doctrine, designed to contain Soviet Russia in areas outside the American Hemisphere. The essential feature of that doctrine is, and always has been, non-aggression while maintaining the military capacity to retaliate in kind against Communist military initiatives. Its informing principle is the military "tit-for-tat" or "retaliation"—the ultimate "tit-for-tat" being, of course, "massive retaliation." The rationale behind the doctrine of containment was the "realistic" acceptance of the European satellite states as legitimate zones of Russian concern and influence.

Stripped of its doubletalk, the Kennedy doctrine punks for the application of this old Truman-Eisenhower containment doctrine to our own hemisphere. Apparently so long as the U.S.S.R. does not use Cuba as an offensive base, it is now to be considered as a legitimate zone of Russian power.

UNITED STATES IN A TRAP

4. Most serious of all, the flubbing of the Cuban invasion and the subsequent buildup

of Castro's satellite island as a Russian military base within easy striking distance of Guantanamo, Cape Canaveral and the Panama Canal, have now placed the United States in a global double bind.

If America should now intervene in Cuba, it must do so at the risk of exposing all its military bases and positions in Europe, the Near East and Asia to the threat of Russian or Communist flanking attacks. But, if it does not intervene and should serious trouble—short of ultimate nuclear war—begin in Berlin, Turkey, Iran, Laos, Vietnam, Formosa or Korea, the United States now risks exposing the Western Hemisphere not only to constant Soviet reconnaissance but also to flanking attacks from Cuba.

ALTERNATIVES

The United States is now faced with two dismaying alternatives: To challenge Russian power in our hemisphere now, at the risk of war breaking out on other global fronts and (unless diplomatic concessions are made quickly there) escalating into World War III; or to sit and wait while Soviet military power builds up, with the very real possibility that communism will take over large areas of Latin America.

It is in this grim global perspective that the people of this Nation must now debate the question of whether or not intervention is "required or justified" in Cuba.

In concealing the extent of our present dilemma from the American people, the President is denying them the right of a free people to debate crucial national issues with all the relevant facts before them.

Short-range political astuteness may indicate the need to play down the size of the present crisis. But long-range statesmanship solemnly demands that the truth be told.

What is now at stake in the decision for intervention or nonintervention in Cuba is the question not only of American prestige but of American survival.

If the decision is not to intervene, then that means the United States accepts the existence of Soviet military and political power in the Western Hemisphere.

Postponing the decision to intervene will not make it any easier. The same arguments which are used against intervention today could and would be used when Russia has control of half a dozen hemisphere countries.

If the United States deems that Russian military power in this hemisphere is intolerable, it would be the part of wisdom to say so clearly now, and to act accordingly. The vast majority of the American people, including most of the President's critics and opponents, will support the President when he takes action.

Friend in Greed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 1, 1962

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people, in ever-growing numbers, demand action against Russian intervention in this hemisphere.

The Florida press has been particularly alert to this threat at our southern door—only 90 miles from our own beaches. Our editors and feature writers report from the vantage point of close proximity to the danger, and with the

rural and urban people. You are showing the way to work effectively with our State and Federal Governments in developing and utilizing our resources for the good of all in the watershed.

The sound program you have developed under Public Law 566 is serving as a guide in the future development of the large watersheds, such as the Delaware, the Susquehanna, and others in the Commonwealth. You are paving the way for others to follow. Large watersheds will only be fully developed when the resources of small watersheds have been planned as you have planned for the Little Schuylkill.

I am proud to say that I was a Member of the 83d Congress which enacted the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. This act enables the local people to develop their soil and water resources to meet their needs. Under this act you can build dams for flood prevention, you can store water for recreation, municipal and industrial purposes, and for fish and wildlife habitat, and you can improve the soil and water, woodland and wildlife, resources for this and future generations.

I believe you ought to know that Public Law 566 is popular in the Nation. Since the act was passed by the U.S. Congress in 1954, more than 779 projects covering 53 million acres have been authorized for planning in the country. In these watersheds the U.S. Soil Conservation Service and the U.S. Forest Service are working with the local people in developing their watershed plans.

One of the fine features of this act is the engineering assistance you receive from the Soil Conservation Service. I know that they have worked closely with you in helping to develop and carry out this program. In addition to the flood prevention features, the act also enables the Soil Conservation Service to speed up its assistance to the landowners in the watershed in establishing the much-needed soil and water conservation measures.

I want to compliment you for the way you have coordinated the services of the Federal and State agencies and local groups in this project. An example of this is the cooperation the Pennsylvania Department of Forests and Waters and the Pennsylvania Game Commission are providing in developing the Locust Creek Dam. You have developed a conservation team to help solve a problem which cannot be handled alone.

It is a source of continued pride for me that we here in Pennsylvania have recognized the opportunities under the Small Watershed Act. Sixty-three applications from 33 counties have been submitted for assistance in developing their watersheds. Ten projects are now in the operation stage and many others are being planned. Seventeen flood prevention dams have already been built, or are under construction, and many others are now on the drawing board. I am pleased to say that a number of these will not only provide flood prevention, but will be used to store much-needed water for many uses by the rural and urban people in Pennsylvania.

Another important part of the Small Watershed Act is the assistance which is provided to farmers and landowners for speeding up the conservation treatment of their land. I can see evidence of this good work throughout this area. The many strip-cropped fields, ponds, tree planting, and terraces that can be seen on the land are evidence that the soil conservation districts in our congressional district of Northumberland, Schuylkill, and Berks Counties are on the job. I want to compliment the directors of these districts for their good work in promoting sound land use.

I am convinced that the watershed protection and flood prevention program offers an orderly and democratic way for developing our natural resources. Working together

as a team, the farmer and his city cousin can develop a program which will control erosion, conserve water, improve wildlife, and prevent floods. To the farmer, this program offers conservation and better land use; to industries and communities, it offers a great deal more flood prevention and an abundant water supply; to the sportsman, it offers better hunting and fishing. It offers something to all in the Little Schuylkill River watershed.

In these times we are hearing a great deal about under-employment, depressed areas, and under-development. In many areas there are also water problems which are adding to our difficulties. With the rapid increase in population, we can expect all of these problems to become even more acute.

One of the solutions, I feel sure, lies in the sound development and proper use of our natural resources. This is a challenge we must accept. The Small Watershed Act provides us with the tools to meet this challenge. I am pleased that you here in the Little Schuylkill have taken up these tools, for this program offers a real opportunity to make the Little Schuylkill River watershed a better place for industry, for business, for the community, for all of us.

Once again, please accept my congratulations for your efforts in promoting this good work.

REMARKS BY BENJAMIN BOLTE, CHAIRMAN, SCHUYLKILL COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

This is a memorable occasion for all of us here in Schuylkill County. I am delighted to see this second dam completed. It is a real pleasure to join with you today in this dedication.

Many of you here today have devoted a great deal of time and effort to this program. The continued assistance of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, the department of forests and waters, the local soil conservation district, and many agencies and groups, has been most helpful. On behalf of the board of county commissioners please accept our thanks and sincere appreciation for all you have done in this watershed.

As you know, only last year we dedicated a dam on the Hosenock Branch of this river. Today we are dedicating this second dam and we are looking forward to the time the entire project will be completed.

We, in Schuylkill County, are placing a great deal of faith in this program. We are hoping it will stop the damaging floods of the past. The project holds promise of increasing our recreational facilities. We are hopeful, too, that this program will improve the economic conditions of the area. It has been several years since we tackled the huge job of planning this 87,000-acre watershed. I believe you will agree that we have made some solid accomplishments. The results are beginning to show.

I am happy to report to you that only last week ground was broken for a much larger dam in this project. The dam is being built above Tamaqua on Locust Creek. A large permanent lake will be created and adjoining the lake will be a State park. All of this will have a healthy effect on the economy of our county.

The county commissioners have long recognized the importance of managing our natural resources. We feel that the Small Watershed Act provides an ideal way to complete this job in the Little Schuylkill. You can be assured that we will continue to encourage the accomplishment of this entire program as rapidly as possible.

This watershed work is a new experience for all of us here in the county. Many people have given a great deal of time and a lot of energy. We have had some minor difficulties but through the hard work and cooperation of many people and groups, we have been able to solve them.

I believe that we will advance even more rapidly in accomplishing the remaining part of the work plan as more and more people can see the direct benefits of the total project. In addition to these dams, a great deal of progress is being made on the land.

Our farmers and landowners in the watershed are doing something about stopping erosion and managing their water through sound conservation practices. I can tell you that we have had excellent cooperation from the farm and city people alike in this program. This fine cooperation makes it gratifying and gives the county commissioners a great deal of encouragement to see the project through to a successful conclusion.

On behalf of the county commissioners, I accept this dam and agree to maintain it so that it will fulfill the purpose for which it was designed.

Again, please accept our appreciation for all you have done in helping to make the Little Schuylkill River watershed a better place in which to live.

Congress Eliminates Back-Door Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of many of us who have actively worked during this session of Congress to eliminate back-door spending have been such as to invite notice in the press. The October 9, 1962, issue of the Washington World included an article entitled "Congress Eliminates Back-Door Spending."

Under leave to include extraneous matter with my remarks I offer for printing at this point an excerpt of this article:

CONGRESS ELIMINATES BACK-DOOR SPENDING

A little-noticed but major accomplishment of the present session of Congress was the almost complete elimination of back-door spending.

Under pressure from determined Members of Congress, President Kennedy's administration decided as a matter of policy this year not to request any new programs of back-door spending.

As a result, the amount was cut from the first session's record-shattering \$19.6 billion to almost nothing this year.

ALLOWS AGENCY BORROWING DIRECTLY FROM TREASURY

Back-door spending allows an agency of the Federal Government to borrow funds directly from the Treasury, thus bypassing the normal appropriations scrutiny of Congress.

Although the final amount of Treasury borrowing has not been compiled this year, Appropriations Committee sources say the sum is inconsequential—and that Congress has finally slammed the door—this session, at least—to that type of spending.

As Congress rumbled to a close, a committee spokesman said this session saw only \$400 million through the back-door route.

The biggest back-door item of the first session was the New Frontier's \$8.8 billion housing bill. When this and a request for \$9.1 billion in mutual security funds for 5 years were presented to Congress, Republicans raised a howl.

Congress approved many Treasury-financed programs but administration strate-

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7311

1962

Wise of grade 7. Julia Steel and Diane Martin, seventh graders, received honorable mentions.

Mrs. Acheson presented Katharine Gresham, grade 12, with the History Award for her aptitude and achievement in that field.

Equally important are those awards which honor girls in their roles as fine citizens of the cathedral community. The school colors, symbolizing leadership, loyalty, and consideration, were given to those girls in the sixth grade who best exemplified these qualities: Lynn Battle, Catherine Cooper, Carole Mast, Perrin Moorhead, Julie Myers, and Edith Price.

Honors of the household, awards to those who contribute to the happiness and well-being of the residence, were last year presented to Shahla Khosrovshahi, Fan Staunton, Nancy Stead, and Mason Winn.

All the aforementioned awards are presented to girls whose achievements are measured and determined by the faculty. Their highest award, the Faculty Citizenship Award, is given to that senior who in their estimation has contributed most to the well ordering of the community and the pleasantness and congeniality of the group. Last year that award went to Fan Staunton.

The Helen Harker Award, on the other hand, is one which is voted by the senior class to the girl who in their estimation best typifies the ideals of NCS. Last year faculty and seniors agreed, for Fan Staunton received that award also.

High academic standings throughout the year are recognized on the honor roll.

Whatever the ideals and aims may be of students and citizens, and whoever rewards them for their efforts, be it faculty, students, or themselves in individual gratification, may the flag, which has produced a prosperous and wealthy Nation, produce intelligent and conscientious students and citizens always.

Epitaph of an Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1962

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thought some of the Members of the House of Representatives with remote island communities in their districts would be interested in an article appearing in the Lincoln County News, September 13, 1962, by Richard Tukey, entitled "Epitaph of an Island."

It is sad to see families move from homes built in many cases by their grandparents. Mr. Tukey has vividly described the exodus on one such island.

EPIGRAPH OF AN ISLAND

(By Richard Tukey)

Loud's Islanders have roots that go back 312 years. This year, 1962, those roots will be torn up. This winter the gales and snow will howl around empty houses. The island will be by itself. Only the lonesome cries of the gulls will break this silence. The island inhabitants will all be on the "main," absorbed into the villages in Lincoln County, scattered about so the close ties built up over many years will be severed or loosened. The children will attend mainland schools and eventually, probably marry mainland people. Few if any will ever go back to live where they were born. The island will die. The names of Poland, Carter, Gifford, Prior,

Teale, Loud, Elwell, Collamore and Garland will still be there but only on the tombstones in the little island Graveyard.

Loud's Island has been bypassed by the modern age but time caught up with it in the form of a falling population until this year when the State closed its grade school as there would be only about four children attending. The parents were put in the position of transporting the children across a mile of open ocean through winter gales and blizzards and landing them on the northern point at Round Pond as the harbor ice locks, or moving off to the mainland. Not wanting to risk the weather during long Maine winters they sadly are making ready to move this fall.

The history of the Island is closely tied to the early history of the United States. Samoset, chief of the powerful and proud Wawenock Indians, made his home here and is said to be buried in the burying ground on the north end of the island. Alexander Gould came to the island in 1650 and was the first white man to settle and build. Over the ensuing years other people followed him as the islands were the safest places from the wild slaughters of the French and Indian wars that decimated this part of the Maine coast. The people on the island had a grand stand view of the naval battle between the *Boxer* and the *Enterprise* which was fought off Pemaquid Point. Lemard Poland of Loud's Island enlisted in the Continental Army at the age of 14, fought at the Battle of Bunker Hill, was at Valley Forge, and returned to live out his life and be buried on the island.

During the Civil War Bristol tried to draft 9 men out of a possible 45 to serve in the army. The islanders objected and drove the draft officer from the island. The State government ruled Bristol had no right to draft men from the island, so the islanders set up their own draft. They all bought substitutes, no man from the island served in the Civil War. They felt they had been wronged by the town of Bristol so refused to pay taxes there, saying, "We are willing to help the United States of America, but we refuse to help Bristol." Life went on, the islanders fishing and farming for their living. The population slowly increased so that in the Census of 1906 the population had reached a total of 118. This seems to be the high tide in the affairs of the island. They had a church, a school and good living. Some of the islanders served with the AEF in France during World War I. Remember the song, "How you going to keep them down on the farm after they've seen Paree"? Some of them never went back to the island. The population slowly started to decrease, the younger people marrying off the island and moving off.

In World War II, islanders joined the Armed Forces, worked in shipyards, in general went right with the war effort. Some of them came back—wounded. One with a leg gone, lost in Italy; one boy was killed in Germany. His body was returned after the war and he now lies buried on his island home. Population new fell off at an increasing pace. Some just came onto the island summers to catch the good fishing, then moved to the "main" in the fall. In 1957 the islanders only numbered about 40 year-round inhabitants. The school population had dropped to 8. The trend was critical. The State hinted of closing the school. The islanders could see the handwriting on the wall, the island was dying.

The year 1961 was the decisive year, six children in school, three graduated, leaving just three if the school opened in the fall. The State decided to close it. In June, Carroll Ellsmore, the single teacher, held the last little graduation exercise, then sadly locked the door on the last of the island children. The end had come. The parents must move to the mainland to give their

children grade school and high school education. Older people without children, suddenly realized they would be alone, only about 10 of them on the island. They couldn't bear the thought of all the empty houses, no children's voices laughing and shouting as they slid down school house hill coming from school in winter. All they would hear would be the crashing of ocean waves on the rocky shores, the storm cries of the gulls, the wild wailing of the winter gales. So they are moving also. When you talk to them about it they seem to know that it is unlikely the young people will ever go back to live there. The old family homes dating from before Revolutionary War days will eventually stand vacant. The paths and roads will be overgrown. The spruce and firs will take over in the fields. Slowly but surely nature will take back what man had wrested from her.

There is an old saying, "That which dies will live again in a different form." If out of staters discover Loud's Island, its remoteness, yet its accessibility, it may become a thriving summer colony. It's up to the natives. In the past they have been reluctant to sell land to off islanders. The situation now may change. There is a new wharf at Little Harbor on the north end. A good deep water anchorage at March Island Harbor. Muscongus Bay is a fascinating boatman's paradise with dozens of uninhabited islands to explore with all of eastern Maine waters opening from it. Time will tell if the island may only sleep for awhile or really come awake with a thriving summer population.

We hope the old houses are not left to go to rack and ruin, disturbed only by vandals that are attracted by their emptiness.

Cuban Debauch Haunts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1962

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, no matter how much the administration has tried to "sweep under the rug" the horrible Cuban debacle, it continues and will continue to haunt us. Not even a manufactured crisis in Berlin could hide it.

George Todt, an able writer for the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner of Sunday, September 30, points it up most capably. I ask unanimous consent his column be inserted into the RECORD:

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION—A GAME FOR EXPERTS

"In all the world's history there has never been a more ill-conceived, misplanned, and pitifully executed military abortion than our Cuban invasion of April 17, 1961 * * * Bay of Pigs debacle."

(Representative JOHN R. PILLION, Republican, of New York—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 18865, Sept. 19, 1962.)

Exactly who and what was to blame for the incompetent comic opera type of military fiasco which failed us at the Bay of Pigs a year and a half ago in Cuba?

Had this simple action been completed successfully, we would not have the threat of Soviet IRBM (Intermediate range) rockets hanging over us today.

At least not from the Caribbean area, fast becoming a new Red Sea.

We may recall that at the time this incredible inept invasion disaster befell us—due mainly to our refusal at the 11th hour

A7312

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 5

to provide adequate air cover—President Kennedy manfully took the blame.

It also may be recalled that many of us instinctively admired him for his loyalty to his underlings in taking full responsibility for what was believed to be their obvious lack of military experience and competence.

What is not generally known to the public is that many of J.F.K.'s chief architects of cold war policy are men devoid of any military experience whatsoever.

Big guns like Dr. Walt Whitman Rostow, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT and Adlai Stevenson—who served only 19 days in the Great Lakes Coast Guard before accepting a World War II plush job in Washington.

These men and their ADA liberal clique who sneer at our highly efficient military officers as being unfit to understand their version of the fight for survival we are in today, had their hands in our unnecessary defeat at the Bay of Pigs.

As former President Truman has said, "If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen."

Inexperienced men in military affairs ought to stay out of our military kitchen—and thereby not goof up legitimate war plans.

When we were at war with the Nazis of Adolph Hitler 20 years ago, the military experts called the shots. Which was fortunate for us. We won the war.

Now in our even more deadly war with the Communist international conspiracy, the tune largely is being called by Rostow, Stevenson, and Fulbright.

No wonder we are losing on every front.

Today Cuba is a Red saber whose cutting edge is aimed at the jugular vein of the United States.

For the best account of how we got in the present fix we are in—with the Soviet armed force just 90 miles away—read the real inside story.

It is titled "Kennedy's Fateful Decision: The Night the Reds Clinched Cuba." On pages 41-42 of the September 17 issue of "U.S. News & World Report."

This story reads well to me and seems correct in every detail.

Actually, it holds the President fully responsible for forbidding the intended Cuban air force from making a vital move—and that was the ball game. Let's set out the facts of this case. What?

Can anyone imagine this will not become a campaign issue?

The Need for a Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 2, 1962

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the Disarmament Conference at Geneva, and as I ponder over this sobering experience I am reminded once again of the tremendous demands which the struggle for international supremacy makes on the American people and their leaders. The future of our country and the free world rests on many factors, none of which is more crucial than the quality of our representatives abroad. We find it easy to understand the need for allocating billions of dollars for defense, but tend to forget that success in foreign policy rests not only on the power of our mili-

tary security, but also on the skill of our diplomats. For this reason several Members of Congress have become convinced that the best defense of America's interests abroad requires a national Foreign Service Academy, comparable to the splendid military academies at West Point, Annapolis, and Colorado Springs.

I have introduced a bill—H.R. 1079—providing for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy, to be supervised by the Secretary of State. Students at the Academy would receive an undergraduate education, leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, with a liberal arts program suitably designed to prepare them to serve their country abroad. Living quarters and a subsistence allowance would be provided by the Academy. Once the first class had graduated, preference in the original appointments of permanent officers of the Foreign Service would be given to graduates of the Academy.

The school established under this bill would have several advantages over our present system of selecting junior Foreign Service officers.

First, it would result in our sending better trained representatives to foreign countries. A Foreign Service Academy should serve as a unique focal point for the study of foreign areas, foreign languages, politics, economics, and history. Enjoying facilities comparable to those of the military academies, it would undertake a level of instruction which can not be expected from private institutions or existing Government agencies.

Second, the Academy would provide a much broader opportunity for American young people interested in serving their country abroad. It would open the doors to young men and women who are unable to secure the necessary training by virtue of their financial circumstances. At the same time, the very existence of a Foreign Service Academy would stimulate interest in service abroad and bring home the message to young Americans that our future as a nation rests on diplomatic skill as well as military strength.

More important, it would put training and recruitment of Foreign Service officers on a professional basis. We have seen in the military academies that the experience of a 4-year program, with students of common interests living together, results in a spirit and dedication that can only operate to the benefit of our country.

Recent events on the international scene, and the growing concern of all Americans over the overwhelming responsibilities facing our country in the coming years make it imperative that we take immediate constructive steps to insure proper training for the men and women on whom we must depend to combat communism all over the world. To say this is not to denigrate the achievements of our diplomats, who have established records of service of which we may all be proud. But in the light of the overwhelming problems which face our country around the world, our procedure for selecting diplomats is too haphazard to do the job. We owe it to our future as a nation to bolster our supply of trained, knowledgeable people to un-

derstand the full implications of the world around us and how to deal with it. A U.S. Foreign Service Academy would demonstrate to the world that America is determined to meet the challenge before us.

Kennedys Trample Due Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1962

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the complete text of an editorial which appeared in the Register, Danville, Va., on October 2, 1962. The editor, in a capable and forceful manner, has pointed out wherein the President and the Attorney General in sending Federal marshals and troops to Oxford, Miss., failed to comply with the constitutional provision relating to due process.

The unwise and impetuous action on the part of the Chief Executive and the Attorney General resulted in a tragic situation which could have been avoided had the rights of the sovereign State of Mississippi been recognized and honored.

Until the arrival of the Federal agents and troops there had been no violence of any sort at Oxford, Miss., and the unfortunate events which followed were precipitated by them. The display of brutal power by the executive department was evidenced by the performance of a trigger-happy U.S. marshal who lobbed a tear gas shell which set off a chain of events resulting in bloodshed and violence, the onus for which will forever be on those responsible for this tragedy. Truly, "they have sown the wind, and they shall reap the whirlwind."

The text of the editorial is as follows:

[From the Danville (Va.) Register, Oct. 2, 1962]

KENNEDYS TRAMPLE DUE PROCESS

Both the President and the Attorney General are misleading the people when they talk about not using force in Mississippi until, as the President said in his Sunday night speech (the court) "made clear the fact that the enforcement of its orders had become the obligation of the U.S. Government."

The Meredith case had not reached that point.

When the Governor of Mississippi, acting in his official capacity, declined to enroll Meredith as a student at the State university, the Fifth U.S. District Court cited Gov. Ross Barnett for contempt of court. It gave him until Tuesday at 11 a.m. to purge himself of contempt.

Attorney General Kennedy, acting in concert with his brother, the President, sent U.S. marshals into Oxford, the small northern Mississippi university town, and he concentrated troops at Memphis, just across the State line in Tennessee.

Neither Bobby Kennedy nor President John F. Kennedy permitted due process to run its course. They couldn't wait to crush Missisippians and due process in a single action.

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7307

rolled in 1 or more of the 30 different courses in electronics and other new electrical techniques.

Management must realize that there is more to automation than just installing new machines. They need to recognize that the changes ahead must be planned with care for the worker. The ingenuity that goes into solving business problems should be applied to the problems of social adjustments.

During the industrial revolution, management shrugged off its social responsibility, with an "everything will take care of itself" attitude. The resulting unrest among laboring people produced a fertile atmosphere for the theories of Karl Marx, which have had much to do with the shape of our world, whether we like it or not.

The new automation revolution is going on now. The question before all of us is: Are we going to lead the way into the new world of automation—or must we be dragged into it?

Cuba
Secretary of State Rusk's News Comments
on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3, 1962

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Secretary of State Dean Rusk has performed a valuable service in appearing on nationwide television to discuss the policies of the United States with regard to Cuba. Mr. Rusk appeared on Howard K. Smith's "News and Comment" program Sunday, September 30. His comments will, I am sure, create a better understanding among us of the situation which presently exists in Cuba. I commend the Secretary's remarks to the Congress and to the public in general and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. JOHN SCALI. Mr. Secretary, in the past we have said that the arms buildup in Cuba is defensive even though Castro has been supplied with missiles. Is it possible now that Russia's plan to build a so-called fishing port tips the balance from a defensive to an offensive buildup?

Secretary Rusk. Well, those announcements have to do with action to be taken in the future. We will be watching that very carefully and closely indeed, and we will make a judgment when we see what in fact actually happens. Now, I don't think that we ought to play with words on this question of defensive and offensive weapons. Any weapon is offensive if you are on the wrong end of it. But the configuration of the military forces in Cuba is a configuration of defensive capability. What we are concerned about is the development of any significant offensive capability against Cuba's neighbors in the Caribbean, or against this country, and we are keeping a very close watch indeed on just that point. We have very great power in that area, and the President has made it very clear that whatever arms are in Cuba will stay in Cuba, and that there will be no effort by Castro to move these arms into other countries.

Question. Mr. Secretary, how will the Government be able to make a judgment

of when the arms buildup shifts from a defensive to an offensive status?

Answer. Well, that would be a matter of detail, affirmation, and judgment based upon all the military views available, and that would be done with our own military advisers taking a full part in an assessment of capabilities.

Question. How would you evaluate the Soviet arms build-up in Cuba in terms of the total Soviet cold war strategy?

Answer. Oh, I think that the Soviets have had to face the fact that this regime in Cuba has been getting into very serious trouble indeed on the island. Foodstuffs are in very short supply, production has dropped off severely, there has been undoubtedly a sense of uneasiness and alarm on the part of the rulers there. They have called, for example, for a considerable number of what seemed to have to be phony alerts. I think they may be trying to draw attention away from some of the problems that they are having on the island. I think that the Cuban situation is certainly becoming very expensive indeed for the bloc to shore up the failures there; but it is also a very serious problem for us and has to be treated as such.

Question. Mr. Secretary, which is the greatest danger to the United States, the potential alienating of much of world opinion by taking firm action against Cuba, or the potential loss of prestige and respect for permitting Russia to outflank us and build a base for subversion next door to us?

Answer. Well, I think neither one of those is a full basis for deciding what action is right and wise and necessary in a given situation. It is clear that the power of the United States is such that you could put armed forces ashore in Cuba, but that means a lot of casualties and it means a lot of Cuban casualties, it means bloodshed. And if we could find an answer without that, we should try to do so.

But the question of prestige is primarily a question of solidarity in this hemisphere. I think that general world opinion is much less interested in Cuba than we are here, for quite understandable reasons. And we have seen here in this hemisphere and are seeing a rapidly growing solidarity with respect to Cuba. The Communists' voices in the hemisphere have become more vocal. But on the other hand, the Castro regime has been losing the sympathy of what might be called the democratic left. It is quite clear that the moderates and conservatives throughout the hemisphere are losing their complacency about Castroism and are becoming more and more active and concerned about it. There has been a dramatic change since the Costa Rica conference of 1960, reflected in the Punta del Este conference in January of this year, and that movement of both peoples and governments in this hemisphere continues. And I am now talking to foreign ministers here in New York, and we will be talking to them next week to see what further steps we ought to take in the situation.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in this coming week of course you will have the so-called informal meeting with the inter-American foreign ministers. Could you tell us why this meeting is an informal one and not a formal one?

Answer. Well, the principal reason is to have a chance to meet as quickly as possible and without all of the problems that are concerned in convening a formal meeting under the Organization of the OAS Charter and encounter many of the other questions that exist there among the different members of the hemisphere. The foreign ministers were gathering here for the United Nations General Assembly. We thought that we ought to take advantage of that fact to meet just as informally as possible. It is not a meeting which can in fact take decisions under the charter of the OAS because it is so very informal, but I already know from

my own talks here in preparation for that meeting that it will be a very profitable and worthwhile meeting.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in the past you have put a great premium on the desirability of unity within the inter-American family. Unhappily, several Latin American countries have dragged their feet on taking effective action against Castro. Is it possible that at this informal meeting you will come up with some sort of plan whereby the nations most immediately threatened by Castroism in the Central American and Caribbean area might join with the United States in some kind of tougher action?

Answer. Well, that was already anticipated in the Punta del Este Conference in January. One of the resolutions that was passed, I think by a 17-vote majority, did provide for joint actions by groups within the hemisphere to deal with this specific question if necessary. We will of course continue not only our consultation with the other countries within the Caribbean area, but we will continue our close cooperative work with them on matters of common security interest—for example, on surveillance in the Caribbean, in being sure that there is no illicit arms traffic in the Caribbean area coming out of Cuba, and a variety of other actions which are being taken behind the scenes with the full cooperation of the governments in that area.

Question. Mr. Secretary, on another point, we find that many of the Cuban exile organizations in the United States are complaining rather bitterly in some cases against the restrictions being put on them by the American Government. Many of them have all sort of plans for returning to the homeland. Why aren't we supporting some of these exile organizations in the United States in allowing them more freedom?

Answer. Well, we have, as you know, been giving considerable support to the refugees as such.

Question. Right.

Answer. Now, as happens so frequently with refugees or exile organizations, there is very little unity among them. There is a contest for influence. They find it difficult to work together. This is the principal problem insofar as any single organization is concerned. Also I think it has to be borne in mind that there are anti-Castro people on the island of Cuba who need to be recognized as having a real stake and part in this whole problem. So that I realize that there are certain groups or certain committees that feel that they ought to be a chosen instrument of some sort. But the great problem and the great need is for all non-Castro Cubans to get together as closely as possible in a great unity of purpose to restore Cuba to the democratic life of the Western Hemisphere.

Question. Mr. Secretary, you have mentioned the anti-Castro underground in Cuba, which we know exists. There are also many people who say that we should take a more active role in supporting this anti-Castro underground, perhaps by supplying them weapons and giving them encouragement through other means. What do you say to this?

Answer. Well, I obviously can't get seriously into that question. The anti-Castro elements in Cuba do know that they have the encouragement and support of everyone in this hemisphere who is opposed to Castroism, but I think that this is the sort of thing or question I can't really get into.

Question. Is it our information, sir, that considerable anti-Castro sentiment exists in Cuba?

Answer. I think that that is very definitely our impression and that this is growing, because of the ruthlessness of the regime and the great severity of the regime on the people and their economy and their traditional way of life. I think we know that the Castro regime has great organized support. It has

A7308

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 5

the accoutrements of a police state, but it also has underneath it what has happened in so many dictatorships of that sort—deep resentment on the part of the people themselves.

Question. Mr. Secretary, the Republicans on Capitol Hill seem to be making quite an issue of the administration policy on Cuba. Now, granted that both Republicans and Democrats have united behind this single resolution supporting the President, do you think that many of the Republican demands which may come up during the election are really political in nature?

Answer. Well, I think that in the present campaign that candidates of both parties are going to be and should be talking about Cuba with the people in their constituencies. I do not believe that except for an occasional instance that this debate can take on a straight partisan line. Cuba has been a problem for two administrations. It is still an unsolved problem. And in my discussions with the committees and the leadership in our Congress, I find that the Democrats and the Republicans are equally concerned about the problem and that they are equally concerned about finding the right course of action under all the circumstances.

There is a national problem here in front of us, and I think vigorous debate is to be expected, and is in any event unavoidable, but I would hope that what is necessarily a national problem does not break itself up into alleged partisan points of view, because I feel and know that the leadership of both parties are deeply concerned—concerned that no satisfactory answer has yet been found and that the penetration of this hemisphere by Castro communism is something which cannot be accepted in the hemisphere and by the United States.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in discussing Cuba with some of the foreign ministers here, I know that you have heard the view expressed by some that Cuba is a United States problem. Do you agree that this is a strictly U.S. problem?

Answer. Well, it is in the first instance a major problem for this hemisphere because of the commitments of the hemisphere under its treaties and charters and in those commitments the United States plays a very important role. It is a problem for us because it is a problem in the hemisphere as well. It would be a problem for us had we not had the hemisphere organizations. But it is here. But it is also a part of a worldwide struggle for freedom. It is involved in a worldwide confrontation between the Communist bloc and the free world, and therefore it is one of those problems which is of concern to all the free world because this struggle is relentless and unending in every continent, and no one can be, I think, disregarding of it.

Question. Mr. Secretary, since this is part of a worldwide Communist plot, could we not soon be approached with a deal to shut down some of our bases overseas in return for which Russia would close down her base in Cuba?

Answer. This is not a negotiable point. This would not be a way to meet this struggle for freedom. You cannot support freedom in one place by surrendering freedom in another. In any event, we have special commitments here in this hemisphere under our hemisphere charters, and we cannot connect in negotiations or in trade the problem of Cuba with the defense of freedom in other places. No. This is not on.

Question. This would also apply to any effort to link Cuba, say, with Berlin?

Answer. Exactly.

Question. Mr. Secretary, are you a baseball fan?

Answer. Yes. I have been for many years.

Question. Do you keep close tab on what the lowly Washington Senators are doing?

Answer. Well, some of my friends think that I am a man of little conscience because I am automatically a hometown fan. I was a New York Yankee fan for many years, and now I am a Washington Senator fan. It hasn't given me too much to cheer about this season, but nevertheless it is a good ball club and I have enjoyed following them.

Question. Do you have any hope that next year it will wind up any better?

Answer. Well, when you wind up in the cellar, you always say "Wait until next year."

Mr. SCALLI. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

Udall Welcomed in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 3, 1962

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall made his first trip to Alaska last week. It was tremendously successful. The Secretary's keen and demonstrated interest in Alaska's development; his pleasing personality; his willingness to meet as many people as possible; his grasp of Alaska's problems, combined to win him a warm welcome in the 49th State. Alaskans liked Secretary Udall. This was well exemplified by the editorial, entitled "Come Again, Mr. Secretary," printed in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner for October 1. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COME AGAIN, MR. SECRETARY

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall made a good impression during his first visit to Fairbanks last week. Encouraging to Alaskans was his obvious interest in the development ahead for our largest State.

Because the Secretary of the Interior controls a vast area in Alaska—the majority of our 586,400 square miles—his interest is vital to our future. While we now have voting Representatives in Washington, and an elected Governor in Juneau, a large part of Alaska's future is either directly under Secretary Udall's jurisdiction or dependent upon policy decisions which are his responsibility.

Rules under which Alaska's resources, above and below the ground and in the seas, can be developed hinge upon Secretary Udall's judgment. Most of Alaska's wildlife and fisheries are controlled by his office; his Geological Survey and Bureau of Land Management, with the Bureau of Mines establish the rules and conditions under which minerals and petroleum can be developed.

Land allotted our State under the enabling act can be turned over to the State no faster than it can be accurately designated by Department of the Interior agencies.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs governs almost every facet of the daily lives of the majority of Alaska's native population.

The Secretary of the Interior controls the many Federal wildlife ranges, national parks, and national monument areas in our State—which include spectacular examples of nature's beauty unmatched elsewhere around the globe. Here lie attractions for visitors (and for Alaskans as well) which are proving an increasingly important economic factor as Alaska's fame as a major American vacation-

land increases. Facilities to accommodate visitors are in most part woefully inadequate or nonexistent in or adjacent to these areas. Needed facilities for Americans to enjoy the wonders of this national heritage will be provided largely upon recommendation of the Secretary's office.

Even access to one of our major visitor attractions—majestic Mount McKinley and nature's unsurpassed wonders in the surrounding park—is largely controlled by Secretary Udall's Department. The Alaska Railroad transports the majority who visit McKinley, and is the only railroad operated by our Federal Government.

Secretary Udall's comments here clearly indicated his acute perception of the value of Alaska's natural wonders to this and future generations.

Equally important, he appears fully aware of practical aspects of wise development of natural resources compatible with prudent trusteeship of primeval areas, so that future generations may enjoy nature's wonders largely in the form left by our Creator.

The Secretary's remarks on the benefits which will accrue from harnessing the Yukon at Rampart to make continuing low-cost power available and simultaneously make adequate provision for the surrounding wildlife area illustrated what appears to us to be wise and considered judgment.

His comparison of Alaska with Russia's Siberia (which he recently visited) was something of a shock: Secretary Udall brought home to us that the Soviets are far, far ahead of us in development of the North Country—and the Russian developments are centered around the huge hydroelectric power projects more than comparable to the 5-million kilowatt Rampart dam, which will be America's largest.

Not only are the Russians already building a huge "Siberian Rampart"—they are also actively making plans for construction of a 20-million kilowatt dam much farther north. This huge installation, four times the size of Rampart, will be built near the mouth of the Lena River, several hundred miles north of Alaska's northern tip at Point Barrow.

Those who question that construction of Rampart is not practical would do well to look at Russia's activities.

Secretary Udall stated, "We are in a power race with the Soviets." While not making any flat statements endorsing feasibility of our Rampart Dam, he indicated he was intrigued with the competitive potential after he visited the Rampart site on the way here.

We were impressed with the sincerity of our present Secretary of the Interior. It was nice to have him with us.

We hope he will come again soon—and often.

The Record of the 87th Congress, 1st Session: Report to the People of the 2d Congressional District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1962

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as has been my custom since my first election to Congress, I wish to report to the people of the mountain-valley Second Congressional District concerning my votes and actions during the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

At this point I would like to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table which lists my rollcall votes during 1961: